

REMARKS

[1-3] The specification is amended as suggested. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

[4-5] Claims 7-9 were rejected under § 112, first paragraph. The text from claim 2, now added to claim 1, is amended to recite “coupled,” rather than “connected,” when expressing a relationship between a first element (“first device” in claim 7) and second element (“second device” in claim 7), which are not integral with each other. The term “connected” is retained to describe physical inseparable relations of an integral body, in accord with the usage in the specification. Also, claim 7 is amended to recite that the two devices are “coupled.” The integral embodiment is now recited in new claim 10 (which is supported in Figs. 5-8 and the present amendment to the specification, and is patentable by its dependence).

[6-7] Claims 1-3 and 5 were rejected under § 102(b) over Meier (US patent 5,583,428). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

(1) Meier does not disclose the feature of amended claim 1, that “the first reflector connected to the first junction surface at an angle of 135 degrees, the first junction surface connected with the emergent end.” This feature is exemplified by Applicant's first junction surface 122 connected to the first reflector 121 and the emergent end 123. In Meier's Fig. 2, no junction surface is disclosed between the first reflector F1 and the emergent end 52.

(2) The Applicant's second reflector 124 connects to the emergent end 123 and the third reflector 114. In Meier, the second reflector F3 doesn't connect to the emergent end 52 or the third reflector F5, and Meier doesn't disclose "the second reflector connected to the emergent end, the second reflector optically coupled to the third reflector at an angle of 90 degrees," as claimed.

(3) The Applicant's fourth reflector 112 connects to the incident end 111. In Meier, the fourth reflector F7 doesn't connect to the incident end 51. Meier doesn't disclose "the fourth reflector connected to the incident end," as claimed.

Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

[6-7] Claims 4 and 6 were rejected under § 103(a) over Meier. This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds set out above regarding the base claim 1.

Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



December 2, 2004

Date

Nick Bromer (Reg. No. 33,478)
RABIN & BERDO, P.C.
CUSTOMER NO. 23995
Telephone: (202) 371-8976
Telefax : (202) 408-0924